# CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	Ιп	Force	П	Discourt.	□ U.S.
Benjamin Wilbur		Team # 3	200807446		Abuse	П	O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:		l	Precinct:	18	Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Monday, 05/26/2008 12:00 PM		§ 87(2)(b)			105	11	/26/2009	11/26/2009
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported:	:	Date/Time	Rece	eived at CCI	RB
Tue, 05/27/2008 2:05 PM		CCRB	Phone		Tue, 05/27	/200	8 2:05 PM	
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Addre	ess					
Witness(es)		Home Addre	ess					
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command					
1. SGT Petamber Nagasar	02350	905611	PBQN AC					
2. POM Won Chang	29627	928055	PBQN AC					
Witness Officer(s)	Shield N	o Tax No	Cmd Name					
1. SGT Aramus Jeanty	02537	924675	PBQ/N					
2. POM Jae Moon	13296	935342	PBQN AC					
Officer(s)	Allegatio	on			Inve	stiga	ator Recon	nmendation
A.SGT Petamber Nagasar	Abuse: S	gt. Petamber Nagasar th nd <sup>§ 87(2)(b)</sup>	areatened to arrest § 8	7(2)(b	<b>b</b> )			
B.SGT Petamber Nagasar	Abuse: Sgt. Petamber Nagasar refused to provide his name to \$\frac{8^{87(2)(b)}}{2^{10}}\$							
C.POM Won Chang	Abuse: PO Won Chang threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)							
D.SGT Petamber Nagasar	Abuse: Sgt. Petamber Nagasar threatened with the use of force.							
E.SGT Petamber Nagasar	Abuse: Sgt. Petamber Nagasar threatened to notify Administration for Children's Services.							
§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)								

# **Synopsis**

On May 27, 2008, \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ filed this complaint with the Civilian Complaint Review Board via telephone. On May 26, 2008, at approximately 12:00 PM, \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ was inside of her home located at \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ in Queens. \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ s doorbell rang and she opened the door and observed four plainclothes officers standing there. PO1 was described as a Turkish/Indian male with a gold shield in his mid-forties. PO1 was identified via investigation as Sgt. Petamber Nagasar. PO2 was described as an Asian male, 5'6" and in his mid-forties. PO2 was identified via investigation as PO Won Chang. PO3 and PO4 were identified via investigation as PO Jae Moon and PO Angel Leon. Sgt. Nagasar asked to speak to \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ regarding a dispute with their neighbor and asked \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ to exit her home, which she did. Sgt. Nagasar allegedly told \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ that he had received numerous complaints about her from her neighbors and that she should shut up or else he would arrest her (Allegation A). \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ then asked Sgt. Nagasar for identification and \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and shield number, and Sgt. Nagasar allegedly wrote down his name as "Sgt. Jerry," telephone numbers and a command on a piece of paper (Allegation B). PO Chang allegedly threatened to arrest \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ as well (Allegation C). Sgt. Nagasar then allegedly spoke to \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ privately and threatened to call ACS to have the \$\frac{\text{\$87(2)(0)}}{\text{\$100}}\$ s children taken away from them (Allegation E). The officers then left without arresting or summonsing anyone.
§ 87(2)(g)
Summary of Complaint
\$87(2)(b) \$87(2)(b) was interviewed at the CCRB on June 9, 2008 (Encl 3-3r). \$87(2)(b) on February 10, 2009, and a series of photos was shown to her (Encl 3-3r). The CCRB spoke with \$87(2)(b) on the phone on February 17, 2009. Another series of photos were shown to \$87(2)(b) on March
25, 2009 (Encl 3-3r). § 87(2)(9)

explained to the undersigned investigator, that she had had a misunderstanding with her next door neighbor, some on May 24, 2008. \$87(2)(b) stated that this dispute was regarding construction that \$87(2)(b) was doing on his home. Sgt. Nagasar stated that he had received numerous complaints from \$87(2)(b) some noise more explained that she had had a dispute with her neighbor but it was taken care of.  \$87(2)(b) asked Sgt. Nagasar for identification. Sgt. Nagasar stated that he would give \$87(2)(b) his identification when he was finished and continued to state that he had complaints from neighbors about \$87(2)(b) when Sgt. Nagasar was finished he gave \$97(2)(b) some humbers written on it, the name "Sgt. Jerry", and the letters "PBQ." \$97(2)(b) some observed Sgt. Nagasar write down this information and hand it to her husband. PO Chang then came over to \$87(2)(b) and told her to stay quiet and that he is "worse" than Sgt. Nagasar. PO Chang also stated that he would lock \$87(2)(b) up. \$87(2)(b) asked Sgt. Nagasar if he was friendly with her neighbors, and Sgt. Nagasar told \$87(2)(b) up. \$87(2)(b) asked Sgt. Nagasar if he was friendly with her neighbors, and Sgt. Nagasar told \$87(2)(b) up. \$87(2)(b) asked Sgt. Nagasar told \$87(2)(b) asked Sgt. Nagasar stated that he was going to call some one" and her children would be taken away. \$87(2)(b) never asked any of the other officers for their names, and PO Moon and PO Leon did not anything notable to \$87(2)(b)
called the undersigned investigator on February 17, 2009, and stated that she had just recalled that she had written down the license plate of the police vehicle and that it was #\$87(2)(0.8)
A series of photos were shown to \$87(2)(b) on February 10, 2009. During this viewing, \$87(2)(b) was shown photographs of sergeants whose names were similar to or could be shortened to "Jerry." There were ten officers altogether. \$87(2)(b) was unable to identify any of the officers as the subject officer. A second series of photos were shown to \$87(2)(b) on March 25, 2009 (Encl 3-3r). During this viewing was shown photographs of all officers who were working with the Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime Unit on the date of the incident. The reason that photos were shown of officers from Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime was that the license plate number provided by \$87(2)(b) corresponds to a vehicle assigned to that command. \$87(2)(b) viewed a series of photos and identified Sgt. Petamber Nagasar as PO1 and PO Won Chang as PO2. She was unable to identify either of the witness officers.
§ 87(2)(b)
was interviewed at the CCRB on April 7, 2009 (Encl 5-5c).
On May 26, 2008, at approximately 12:00 PM, \$87(2)(b) was inside of his home, located at \$87(2)(b) had not been outside of their home that morning. \$37(2)(b) heard a loud banging on his door, and he and his wife went downstairs to see who was there. \$87(2)(b) asked who was there and someone answered "Police." When \$87(2)(b) opened the door he observed two plainclothes officers standing there. PO1 was described as an Indian male, who was 5'5", with a medium build, black hair, a mustache and in his early 40s. PO1 has been identified via investigation as Sgt. Petamber Nagasar. PO2 was described as a Phillipino male, who was 6'0", with a skinny build, black hair and in his late 40s. PO2 has been identified via investigation as PO Won Chang. \$87(2)(b) observed a silver and blue shield around Sgt. Nagasar's neck but he did not observe any information on it.
Sgt. Nagasar stated that he wanted to ask the \$87(2)(b) a few questions and asked that they go out onto the front lawn with the officers. Sgt. Nagasar told \$87(2)(b) that his next door neighbor filed some complaints against the \$87(2)(b) Once outside, \$87(2)(b) observed two more plainclothes officers, PO3 and PO4, identified via investigation as PO Angel Leon and PO Jae Moon. Sgt. Nagasar asked why he was harassing his neighbors and told him that if he did not stop he would make \$87(2)(b) move out of the neighborhood and turn over his children to Administration of Children Services. PO Chang told the \$87(2)(b) that he needed to listen to Sgt. Nagasar since he was the boss and Sgt. Nagasar confirmed that he was the boss. Sgt. Nagasar was screaming the entire time. Sgt. Nagasar then spoke with \$87(2)(b) alone while PO Chang spoke with \$87(2)(b) Sgt. Nagasar said that he was the boss here and that only he

could talk. Sgt. Nagasar told § 87(2)(b) that if he heard any more complaints from the neighbor then he
would arrest \$87(2)(b) and he wanted to arrest \$87(2)(b) on that day. \$87(2)(b) believed that Sgt.
Nagasar threatened to shoot him if he did not stop bothering the neighbors, but \$87(2)(b) could not
specifically remember what was said. § 87(2)(b) was very upset but did not speak back to Sgt. Nagasar.
Sgt. Nagasar then told \$87(2)(b) that anytime he saw \$87(2)(b) again he would pull him over and
arrest him. §87(2)(b) has not seen any of these officers since that date. §87(2)(b) recalled that at some
point during this interaction §87(2)(b) asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and shield. Sgt. Nagasar initially
told him to wait, but eventually wrote down his information on a piece of paper and handed it to
\$87(2)(b) \$87(2)(b) acknowledged that the paper given by his wife to the CCRB was the one he
recognized as having been handed to him by Sgt. Nagasar. §87(2)(b) recalled that at some point Sgt.
Nagasar yelled at \$87(2)(b) to stop talking so much, but he could not remember at what point during the
incident this was said. § 87(2)(b) and his wife went back inside and once inside, they observed the police
speaking to his neighbor, who he believed to be §87(2)(b) The entire incident lasted approximately
an hour and fifteen minutes.

# **Results of Investigation**

# Witness

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)
provided a phone statement on April 8, 2009. § 87(2)(b) was interviewed at his job, § 87(2)
on April 28, 2009 (Encl 6-6b) § 87(2)(9)
<u> </u>
On May 26, 2008, at approximately 12:00 PM, \$87(2)(b) was outside with his children playing in their
front yard. and \$87(2)(b) walked over to \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) started to yell and curse
at § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) made threats towards him, but § 87(2)(b) did not recall what those
specific threats were. \$87(2)(b) sent his children inside and argued with the \$87(2)(b) for at least twenty
minutes. After twenty minutes, \$87(2)(b) noticed an unmarked police vehicle coming down the street
and he flagged it down. When the \$87(2)(b) noticed what he was doing they went back to their front yard.
\$ 87(2)(b) saw either three or four plainclothes officers exit the vehicle. \$ 87(2)(b) could not
describe them well, but recalled that they were all male and at least one was Asian; there may have been
another Asian, Hispanic and white male, but he was not sure. §87(2)(b) spoke with an Asian and
Hispanic officer for five minutes and explained the situation to them, that he and the \$87(2)(b) were having a
dispute. The officers then went over to the §87(2)(b) and spoke with them for five minutes, but
did not hear this conversation. After five minutes, the officers brought the 887(2)(b) over to
and made everyone shake hands. One of the officers, identified via investigation as Sgt.
Petamber Nagasar, told everyone that they had to live nicely as neighbors and should not get into fights.
then asked Sgt. Nagasar, who appeared to be in charge, for a phone number and name in
case he has a problem with the \$87(2)(b) again. \$87(2)(b) ran into his home and got a piece of paper.
He ripped the paper in half and asked Sgt. Nagasar for the information. §87(2)(b) recalled that he, §
wrote the information down himself and could not recall if Sgt. Nagasar himself wrote down the
information for the \$87(2)(b) or if the \$87(2)(b) wrote down the information themselves. During
s 87(2)(b) s phone statement he indicated that Sgt. Nagasar wrote down the information on the piece of
paper. \$87(2)(b) misplaced the piece of paper with the information on it and did not recognize the
paper that the \$87(2)(b) provided for the investigation. The officers then left the area. The entire incident
lasted approximately half an hour. At no point did \$87(2)(b) hear any officer threaten to arrest or shoot anyone, call ACS, or use profanity. \$87(2)(b) stated that the officers were cordial and helpful the
entire time.
chure unic.

### **Identification of Officers Interviewed**

described PO1 as a Guyanese male, however, was a self-proclaimed Turkish and Indian male, who wrote his name on a piece of paper as "Sgt. Jerry" and indicated to \$87(2)(6) that he was working out of Patrol Borough Queens. A search of all the sergeants assigned to that command indicated that there

was only one sergeant whose name was similar to Sgt. "Jerry," which was the name written on the paper. That officer is Sgt. Aramus Jeanty (Encl 4). For this reason Sgt. Jeanty was interviewed.

provided the license plate number of the vehicle that the officers were driving as \$\sec{8.97(2)0.8}\$ This license plate number corresponded to a vehicle assigned to Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime on the date of the incident. This vehicle is RMP # 673. On the date of the incident Sgt. Nagasar and PO Leon were assigned to that vehicle. Based on a second series of photos shown to \$\sec{8.7(2)0}\$ she indicated that Sgt. Nagasar and PO Chang were the subject officers in this investigation. It was confirmed via roll call that Sgt. Nagasar and PO Chang were both working on the date of the incident. Based on PO Chang's statement, it was determined that PO Moon was working with Sgt. Nagasar and PO Chang on the date of the incident and that all three officers were present for this incident. Therefore, Sgt. Nagasar, PO Moon and PO Chang were interviewed.

#### Officer Statement

Sgt. Petamber Nagasar

Sgt. Nagasar is a [87(2)b) old Native American male who is 5'10", 170 pounds with black hair and brown eyes. Sgt. Nagasar was interviewed at the CCRB on April 2, 2009 (Encl 7-7c). On May 26, 2008, Sgt. Nagasar worked from 9:13 AM until 6:10 PM. He was assigned to the Queens Intelligence Division, which is part of Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime, and partnered with PO Chang. It was determined via roll call that Sgt. Nagasar was not partnered with PO Chang, but rather with PO Leon. Sgt. Nagasar was in plainclothes, assigned to an unmarked vehicle and did not have any memo book entries regarding this incident.

On May 26, 2008, at approximately 12:00 PM, Sgt. Nagasar was driving to the 105th Precinct with PO Chang and possibly other officers, but Sgt. Nagasar could not recall who those other officers were. He did not recall if one of the other officers was PO Moon. As the officers were driving they were flagged down by at least two males and one female having a dispute in the street outside of § 87(2)(b) Village. Sgt. Nagasar was shown a photo of § 97(2)(b) which he did not recognize but he did recall that the female had a high pitched voice. The female was identified through investigation as \$87(2)(b) the males were identified as §87(2)(b) and §87(2)(b) Sgt. Nagasar exited the vehicle and instructed everyone to go back to their homes. Sgt. Nagasar then spoke to \$87(2)(6) for three minutes and then walked to § 87(2)(b) s home and spoke to § 87(2)(b) for three minutes. Sgt. Nagasar did not speak to except to tell her to go inside her home. Sgt. Nagasar recalled that § 87(2)(b) was upset but not terribly so. § 37(2)(b) asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name which he verbally provided but did not recall if he wrote it down or if \$37(2)(b) did. Sgt. Nagasar was shown the note that he allegedly wrote and stated that it was not his handwriting. Sgt. Nagasar then told the §87(2)(b) that they needed to go to civil court and that the police could not help. Neither Sgt. Nagasar nor any other officer threatened to arrest or shoot anyone, refused to provide their names or threatened to call ACS. Sgt. Nagasar and the officers were there for ten minutes before they left. Sgt. Nagasar stated that he does not go by the nickname "Sgt. Jerry".

# PO Won Chang

PO Chang is a [87(2)(0)] old Asian male who is 6'0", 180 pounds with black hair and brown eyes. PO Chang was interviewed at the CCRB on April 2, 2009 (Encl 8-8d). On May 26, 2008, PO Chang worked from 9:30 AM until 6:05 PM. He was partnered with PO Moon and assigned to anti-crime patrol. PO Chang was in plainclothes and assigned to an unmarked sedan. PO Chang did not have any memo book entries regarding this incident.

On May 26, 2008, at approximately 12:00 PM, PO Chang was headed to his command with Sgt. Nagasar and PO Moon when they observed a dispute in the middle of the street between a male and a female identified via investigation as \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) This occurred outside of \$87(2)(b) in Queens Village. PO Chang was shown a photo of \$87(2)(b) but he did not recognize her. PO Chang stated that Sgt. Nagasar told both people to go to their yards which they did. PO Chang then spoke to one party and Sgt. Nagasar spoke to the other and then the officers switched. PO Chang did not recall what the dispute was about. PO Chang stated that the female was upset but not belligerent in any way. After ten minutes, the two neighbors calmed down and shook hands. PO Chang stated that at some point the female

asked him for his name which he verbally provided. PO Chang did not recall if any other individuals came outside during this dispute, nor did any other officers arrive. PO Chang never threatened to arrest anyone, nor did he hear any other officer, including Sgt. Nagasar, threaten to arrest anyone, shoot anyone, or call ACS to take anyone's children away. PO Chang never heard either of the parties ask any other officer for their name, nor did he see any other officer write this information down. PO Moon did not speak to either of the parties; he stayed at the police vehicle at all times.

#### PO Jae Moon

PO Moon is a \$87(2)(6) old Asian male who is 5'8", 180 pounds with black hair and brown eyes. PO Moon was interviewed at the CCRB on April 13, 2009 (Encl 9-9c). On May 26, 2008, PO Moon was scheduled to work from 9:30 AM until 6:05 PM, but ended work early at 3:35 PM. PO Moon was assigned to Borough Anti-Crime and worked with Sgt. Nagasar and PO Chang. PO Moon was in plainclothes and assigned to an unmarked sedan. PO Moon did not have any memo book entries regarding this incident.

On May 26, 2008, PO Moon and his partners were driving from the 105<sup>th</sup> Precinct to continue their patrol when they were flagged down by at least three neighbors of mixed genders. PO Moon could not recall at what time this incident occurred, but the investigation determined that it occurred at noon outside of 187(2) in Queens Village. All three officers exited the vehicle and Sgt. Nagasar and PO Chang went to go speak to the disputing parties while PO Moon stayed by the vehicle. PO Moon never spoke to any of the civilians nor did he overhear any conversations between the officers and the civilians. The entire incident lasted ten to fifteen minutes. PO Moon never saw Sgt. Nagasar write anything down on a piece of paper. PO Moon did not hear Sgt. Nagasar refuse to provide his name and shield number, threaten to arrest anyone, threaten to shoot anyone or threaten to call the Administration of Children's Services. PO Moon did not hear PO Chang threaten to arrest 187(2)(6) PO Moon was shown photographs of both 187(2)(5) but he did not remember them.

Sgt. Aramus Jeanty

Sgt. Jeanty is a \$87(2)(b) old black male who is 6'0", 225 pounds with black hair and brown eyes. Sgt. Jeanty was interviewed at the CCRB on December 3, 2008 (Encl 10-10b). On May 26, 2008 Sgt. Jeanty was not working, he was on vacation, which is confirmed via roll call.

During Sgt. Jeanty's interview he stated that he was on vacation on May 26, 2008. Sgt. Jeanty brought with him to his interview a receipt of vacation request from his commanding officer indicating that Sgt. Jeanty took leave from May 26, 2008 until May 30, 2008.

#### Officers Not Interviewed

Based on the roll call for the Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime command on February 17, 2009, Sgt. Nagasar was partnered with PO Angel Leon. §87(2)(9)

# **Police Documentation**

#### Fleet Services

A telephone call to the Fleet Services division of the NYPD on February 17, 2009, determined that the vehicle with the license plate of #\$\(\frac{8}{2}\)(2)(0.\) is assigned to the Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime command, and that it was assigned to RMP # 673 (Encl 13-13e).

### SPIA Request/Sprint Request

There is no record of any SPRINT reports related to this incident. A search of the SPIA database was conducted between the dates of May 25, 2008 and May 31, 2008. The results were negative for this incident (Encl 12-12a).

Stop, Question and Frisk Log

The stop, question and frisk log did not reveal any information regarding an interaction with or and the police on the incident date (Encl 15-15u).

#### Roll Call

The roll call for Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime on May 26, 2008, indicates that Sgt. Nagasar was assigned to vehicle #673 while PO Moon and PO Chang were assigned to RMP #806. Sgt. Nagasar assignment was Field Intelligence Officer and PO Chang and PO Moon were assigned to the Anti-Crime Blast team. According to the roll call PO Leon was also assigned to car #673 with Sgt. Nagasar (Encl 11).

### **Police Officer CCRB History**

Neither Sgt. Nagasar nor PO Chang has any previously substantiated CCRB allegations against them. Sgt. Nagasar has fifteen-years tenure with the NYPD and PO Chang has seven-years tenure with the NYPD (Encl 1-1d).

### **Civilian CCRB History**

Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) has participated in any previous investigations with the CCRB (Encl 1-1d).

#### **Record of Criminal Convictions**

Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) has a record of criminal convictions in New York City.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

#### **Identification of Subject Officers**

stated that when the officers pulled up to her home, she was able to write down the license plate number of the vehicle they were driving. This license plate number is #\$57(2)(0.\$ A search of the fleet service database determined that that vehicle was RMP #673 and belonged to Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime. According to the roll call, Sgt. Nagasar and PO Leon were using this vehicle on the date of the incident. According to the officers' statements, Sgt. Nagasar and PO Leon were working with PO Chang and PO Moon, who were assigned to RMP #806, which is also unmarked. \$57(2)(0) was then shown photos of all of the officers from Patrol Borough Queens North Anti-Crime, who were working at the time of the incident, and she identified Sgt. Nagasar and PO Chang as the subject officers of the incident. \$537(2)(0) also clearly delineated which allegations were against which officer. Both Sgt. Nagasar and PO Chang match the pedigree information provided by \$57(2)(0) and admit to being involved in this incident. It was alleged that Sgt. Nagasar threatened to arrest and \$57(2)(0) and admit to being involved in this incident. It was alleged that Sgt. Nagasar threatened to arrest and \$57(2)(0) and admit to being and threatened to call ACS. \$57(2)(0) \$57(2)(0) \$57(2)(0) and threatened to call ACS.

### **Disputed Facts**

It is disputed whether Sgt. Nagasar or any officer knocked on the \$87(2)(b) door or whether the officers first confronted the \$87(2)(b) on the front lawn. It is disputed whether Sgt. Nagasar threatened to arrest \$87(2)(b) It is disputed whether PO Chang threatened to arrest \$87(2)(b) It is disputed whether PO Chang threatened to arrest \$87(2)(b) It is disputed whether Sgt. Nagasar wrote down information which he claimed to be his own on a piece of paper, and gave it to \$87(2)(b) It is disputed whether the dispute ended amicably with the \$87(2)(b) and \$87(2)(b) shaking hands.

# **Undisputed Facts**

It is undisputed that the officers stopped as a result of being flagged down by \$87(2)(b) regarding a dispute he was having with and \$87(2)(b) It is undisputed that the officers spoke with both of the disputing parties. It is undisputed that Sgt. Nagasar was asked for his name and shield number.
Assessment of Evidence
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
Allegation A: Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Nagasar threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) and and
§ 87(2)(b)
Allegation D: Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Nagasar threatened to shoot §87(2)(b)  Allegation E: Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Nagasar threatened to notify Administration for Children's
Services.
§ 87(2)(g)
Allegation B: Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Nagasar refused to provide his name to \$87(2)(b)
Allegation B: Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Nagasar refused to provide his name to Sa7(2)(b)  Both and Sa7(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.
Both and and server alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by
Both and ser(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name,
Both and ser(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name, shield number and command to anyone who request you to do so" (Encl 1-1h).
Both and ser(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name, shield number and command to anyone who request you to do so" (Encl 1-1h).
Both and ser(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name, shield number and command to anyone who request you to do so" (Encl 1-1h).
Both and ser(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name, shield number and command to anyone who request you to do so" (Encl 1-1h).
Both and ser(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name, shield number and command to anyone who request you to do so" (Encl 1-1h).
Both and ser(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name, shield number and command to anyone who request you to do so" (Encl 1-1h).
Both and \$37(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name, shield number and command to anyone who request you to do so" (Encl 1-1h).
Both and ser(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name, shield number and command to anyone who request you to do so" (Encl 1-1h).
Both and \$37(2)(b) alleged that they asked Sgt. Nagasar for his name and identifying information and that Sgt. Nagasar wrote it down on a piece of paper and gave it to them. The information provided by Sgt. Nagasar proved to be incorrect.  According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 "An officer must courteously and clearly state rank, name, shield number and command to anyone who request you to do so" (Encl 1-1h).

§ 87(4-b), § 87(2)(g)	
	_
Investigator:	Date:
Supervisor:	Date:
Reviewed by:	Date:

Date:

Reviewed by: